

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,238	BRONSTEIN, ALEXANDRE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew D. Hoel	3714	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.

(2) Paul Horstmann, attorney.

Date of Interview: 15 July 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NF (12-24-2009).

Claims discussed:

71-88.

Prior art documents discussed:

von Ahn (entered as NPL, 10-20-2003); Wood (5,839,902 A).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/M. D. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 3714

Status of Application: allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: P.M.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant to indicate that he believed that the most significant aspect of the claims and the specification was the actual cabability of the depicted actual object in real life, not any aspect that pertained to the depiction itself. This knowledge of an actual or real-world capacity of a depicted object or thing that exists in real life would require actual knowledge on the part of the user, such as a game player or student for example, of what the depicted object is actually capable of doing. This prevents OCR (object character recognition or machine vision) bots (automatic programs or scripts) from scanning Captcha text and reading it to defeat attempts by the server to prevent automated sign-ups, such as for e-mail accounts, and ensure that only humans are able to sign onto the system by providing a test that only actual people are likely to pass. The applicant subsequently faxed proposed claims for discussion purposes along these lines. The applicant authorized the examiner to enter the proposed claims by examiner's amendment and add "real-world" before "capability" in the eleventh line of Claim 76..